

APSA Awards Presented at the 1985 Annual Meeting

Dissertation Awards

(Each award includes a cash prize of \$250.)

Gabriel A. Almond Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1983 or 1984 in the field of comparative politics.

Recipient: **David Pion-Berlin**, Ohio State University. "Ideas as Predictors: A Comparative Study of Coercion in Peru and Argentina," submitted by the University of Denver.

Selection Committee: Robert H. Bates, California Institute of Technology, Chair; Ellen Comisso, University of California, San Diego; Goldie Shabad, Ohio State University.

Dissertation Chair: **John F. McCamant**.

Citation: Pion-Berlin's dissertation focuses on the interaction between economics and politics in third-world countries. It concentrates on the impact of macro-economic policies upon political liberties in general and participation by the working classes in particular. In so doing, it studies a topic of great interest both to policymakers and students of comparative politics.

As an alternative to class-based explanations, or ones drawing on the differences between civilian and military regimes, Pion-Berlin attributes a causal role to economic doctrines and the policy prescriptions that they contain. In so doing, he provocatively underscores the political significance of what is often offered as "technical" advice.

Particularly given the state of the economies of third-world nations, Pion-Berlin's work stands as a timely and significant contribution to comparative politics.

William Anderson Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1983 and 1984 in the field of inter-governmental relations.

Recipient: No award given this year.

Selection Committee: Patricia S. Florestano, University of Maryland, Chair; J. Theodore Anagnoson, California State University, Los Angeles; Joseph F. Zimmerman, SUNY at Albany.

Edward S. Corwin Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1983 or 1984 in the field of public law.

Recipient: **Kim Lane Scheppele**, University of Michigan. "Legal Secrets: Common-Law

Rules and the Social Distribution of Knowledge," submitted by the University of Chicago.

Selection Committee: Gayle Binion, University of California, Santa Barbara, Chair; Donald W. Jackson, Texas Christian University; Lettie M. Wenner, University of Illinois, Chicago.

Dissertation Chair: **James Coleman**.

Citation: The Edward S. Corwin Award Committee has selected Professor Kim Lane Scheppele as the 1985 recipient. Her dissertation, entitled, "Legal Secrets: Common Law Rules and the Social Distribution of Knowledge," is, in the judgment of its nominator, "remarkable." The Corwin Award Committee shares this judgment.

Professor Scheppele's thesis explores the treatment of privacy in the American common law. She does an impressive job of challenging and, in a sense, refuting, the view that economic efficiency determines the assignment of rights. Her analysis of the case law on privacy demonstrates the importance that the courts have placed on principles of equity in the resolution of disputes. The thesis is informed by both traditional legal analysis and sociology of law. The two approaches are subtly and effectively integrated.

This dissertation has made a substantial contribution to knowledge. It demonstrates all of the virtues of fine scholarship: originality, depth, comprehensiveness, and intellectual integrity. It truly deserves the recognition that it has received.

Harold D. Lasswell Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1983 or 1984 in the field of policy studies.

Recipient: **Bruce W. Jentleson**, University of California, Davis. "Pipeline Politics: The Alliance and Domestic Politics of American Economic Coercion Against the Soviet Union," submitted by Cornell University.

Selection Committee: James E. Anderson, University of Houston, Chair; Michael Lipsky, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Anne Permaloff, Auburn University at Montgomery.

Dissertation Chair: **Peter Katzenstein**.

Citation: Bruce Jentleson's dissertation deals with profound and important issues that deserve the careful illumination that he accords them. He convincingly argues for the need to link international and domestic levels of policy analysis and then moves on to present a careful over-time analysis of American economic policy toward the Soviet Union. The differing viewpoints on the application of

economic coercion are clearly and dispassionately presented.

Essentially, what we encounter in the dissertation is a series of case studies, analytical in style, and adeptly employed to illustrate and substantiate his theoretical perspective. Although it was not his purpose, he demonstrates the usefulness of the case method, carefully employed, for rigorous political analysis.

Jentleson's dissertation is written in a clear, straightforward manner that makes it accessible to a wide range of people. It is then, with pleasure, that Professors Permaloff, Lipsky, and I make the Lasswell Award to Bruce Jentleson for the best doctoral dissertation in the area of policy studies.

Helen Dwight Reid Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1983 or 1984 in the field of international relations, law and politics.

Recipient: **Wayne A. Edisis**, "The Hidden Agenda: Negotiations for the Generalized System of Preferences," submitted by Brandeis University.

Selection Committee: Charles Kegley, University of South Carolina, Chair; Condoleezza Rice, Stanford University; Edward Weisband, SUNY at Binghamton.

Dissertation Chair: **Robert O. Keohane**.

Citation: The Helen Dwight Reid Committee unanimously recommends Wayne A. Edisis, *The Hidden Agenda: Negotiations for the Generalized System of Preferences* for the 1985 Reid award. This dissertation, which examines the historic negotiations leading to the establishment of the Generalized System of Preferences, combines rich descriptive detail with original analytical insight, thus contributing significantly to understanding of one of the most complex but major recent developments in world political economy. The conceptual framework introduced by Mr. Edisis, moreover, illuminates several bodies of literature within this study of world politics and political economy including those relevant to regime formation, structuralism, negotiation theory, terms of trade, coalition behavior and development. Mr. Edisis thus succeeds where so many others fail. His pioneer effort not only adds a wealth of information regarding relations between advanced and developing societies, but also to theoretical analysis attempting to assess fundamental relations and causal linkages between continuity and change in world society.

E. E. Schattschneider Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted

during 1983 or 1984 in the field of American government.

Recipient: **John Zaller**, Princeton University. "The Role of Elites in Shaping Public Opinion," submitted by the University of California, Berkeley.

Selection Committee: Marjorie R. Hershey, Indiana University, Chair; R. Douglas Arnold, Princeton University; George C. Edwards III, Texas A&M University.

Dissertation Chair: **Nelson W. Polsby**.

Citation: In his APSA presidential address last year, Herbert Simon stressed that "the question of where political ideas come from is not only highly deserving of study, but also within the competence of our contemporary research techniques." John R. Zaller's dissertation, "The Role of Elites in Shaping Public Opinion," is a very ambitious and productive effort to address that question.

Zaller's argument is that new political attitudes originate and come to gain public support in a top-down process. New issues and challenges to existing norms develop within the nation's scientific and policy elite sub-cultures, which place high value on innovation through systematic analysis. These new attitudes are first disseminated by professional politicians and the media, whose own sub-cultural norms lead them to defer to scientific and policy elites as to which ideas will receive serious public attention. Ultimately, the new attitudes diffuse among members of the public depending upon each individual's level of political knowledge, sophistication, and ideological distance from the attitude—in short, the individual's level of exposure to the new attitude and acceptance of it. The dissertation examines these arguments in relation to three issues on which major attitudinal shift occurred: school desegregation in the 1950s, the Vietnam war in the 1960s, and gay rights in the 1970s. Using data from several National Election Studies and the 1978 McClosky study of Civil Liberties in America, Zaller develops a formal model of attitude formation and change, first assuming elite unanimity on the issue and then incorporating the circumstance in which there are competing elite messages on the same issue.

This is an exceptional dissertation in a number of ways. First, its scope is remarkable. Zaller's work encompasses several major areas of literature—on the nature of leadership, elite sub-cultures, the role of the press, the development of public opinion—and dares to link them in an original theory that teaches us about agenda-setting in American politics. In doing so, he enriches our understanding of each of these fields; his work on occupational

sub-cultures, for example, is a very fruitful approach to the study of elite politics. His general model of attitude change helps to set in context various efforts to develop "domain-specific" models of attitude formation and change. The data analysis is entirely appropriate, careful, and sophisticated. And the dissertation is an excellent example of effective argumentation.

John Zaller takes the great risk in this dissertation of raising important questions about the nature of political issues and orientations, rather than simply attempting to "fill a lacuna" somewhere in the literature. In the process he offers us a new way of thinking about politics. It is the committee's great pleasure to recognize that contribution by presenting him with the E. E. Schattschneider Award.

Leo Strauss Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1983 or 1984 in the field of political philosophy.

Recipients: **Ruth Grant**, University of Chicago. "John Locke's Liberalism," submitted by the University of Chicago. **Ian Shapiro**, Yale University. "Individual Rights in Modern Liberal Thought: A Realist Account," submitted by Yale University.

Selection Committee: Amy Gutmann, Princeton University, Chair; Tracy B. Strong, University of California, San Diego; Catherine H. Zuckert, Carleton College.

Dissertation Chairs: **Joseph Cropsey** for Ruth Grant. **Douglas W. Rae** for Ian Shapiro.

Citation: The 1985 Leo Strauss Award is presented to two doctoral dissertations: "John Locke's Liberalism," by Ruth Grant, and "Individual Rights in Modern Liberal Thought: A Realist Account," by Ian Shapiro.

In "John Locke's Liberalism," Ruth Grant defends Lockean liberalism against two persistent criticisms. In response to the criticism that liberalism puts legalistic process above moral substance, Grant shows that Locke's argument on behalf of limited government does not blind him to the need for substantive judgment in particular cases. In response to the criticism of liberalism for its emphasis on the primacy of the individual over the common good, Grant shows how Locke succeeded in defending individual liberty (including the individual's right to resist) without defending possessive individualism, which would be incompatible with moral community.

"Strange as it may seem," Grant writes, "the claim that Locke's work can be read as an orderly demonstration, carefully written, with a coherence that is present on the surface of

the text as well as at its deeper layers of meaning is probably the single most unusual claim of the thesis." Grant supports this unconventional claim with an admirable degree of analytical rigor by showing, among other things, that Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* and his *Two Treatises on Civil Government* do not serve separate and distinct purposes, and that, more generally, Locke's writings form a theoretically and politically consistent whole. Her arguments are models of theoretical clarity and consistency.

In "Individual Rights in Modern Liberal Thought," Ian Shapiro presents what he calls a "realist" account of modern liberal theories of individual rights. He traces the liberal defense of individual rights through four historical phases: innovative, classical, neo-classical, and Keynesian. Although he makes no claim to historical comprehensiveness, Shapiro's discussion is about as comprehensive as one can imagine a doctoral dissertation being—even one of 492 pages. Each chapter analyzes liberal theories on their own terms and also situates them in an evolving ideological tradition. Shapiro provides an original reading of that tradition, as four analytically distinct but historically related ways of using political theory to aid in the reproduction of the modern social world.

"Individual Rights in Modern Liberal Thought" ends with a critique of the deontological turn in contemporary liberal theory. Like his analysis of liberalism, Shapiro's critique is original. "We must recognize," he concludes, "... that morality is inevitably in part teleological, and that substantive conceptions of the good cannot be avoided in arguments of right and justice. But . . . we must [also] acknowledge that a theory of the good is inevitably in significant part empirical. This entails a more general injunction to come off the terrain of 'ideal' theory and get soiled by the nitty-gritty of factual arguments about the causal structure of the social world which is, after all, where problems of social justice arise." Shapiro poses a challenge worthy of the consideration of contemporary theorists.

Leonard D. White Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1983 or 1984 in the field of public administration, including broadly related problems of policy formation and administrative theory.

Recipient: **Donald W. Chisholm**, University of California, Berkeley. "Informal Organization and the Problem of Coordination," submitted by the University of California, Berkeley.

Selection Committee: Earl M. Lewis, Trinity

University, San Antonio, Chair; Gary Miller, Michigan State University; Kathryn Newcomer, George Washington University.

Dissertation Chair: **Martin Landau.**

Citation: The 1985 Leonard D. White Award for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public administration is awarded to Donald W. Chisholm of the University of California, Berkeley, for his dissertation "Informal Organization and the Problem of Coordination." Chisholm's study confirms the capacity of informal organization to coordinate agencies in a multiorganization system that lacks centralized authority. His focus of analysis is the San Francisco Bay Area public transit system, which consists of six operating, autonomous, and interdependent organizations. He documents multiple instances of informal interaction through which officials from different elements of that system coordinated important facets of the work of their organizations. Interdependence and recurring uncertainty were crucial stimuli of informal organization and the coordination it achieved.

That coordination had at least two distinguishing features: its singular interest in responding to the needs of organizations, and its impressive effectiveness in coordinating the work of autonomous agencies with high levels of bilateral interdependency. These important and understudied functions of informal organization have potential for "practical application" in a variety of contexts. They of course deserve further study.

Book and Paper Awards

Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha Award (\$250) for the best paper presented at the 1984 Annual Meeting.

Recipients: **Jack L. Walker**, University of Michigan, "Three Modes of Political Mobilization." **Michael Wallerstein**, University of California, Los Angeles, "The Micro-Foundations of Corporatism: Formal Theory and Comparative Analysis."

Selection Committee: Edward G. Carmines, Indiana University, Chair; David R. Cameron, Yale University; Karen A. Feste, University of Denver.

Citation: Owing to the equally outstanding papers by Professors Jack Walker and Michael Wallerstein, the Committee wishes to make two awards this year.

Professor Walker's paper, "Three Modes of Political Mobilization," deals with a question of fundamental importance to democratic governance—why are some social groups better represented in the American political

process than others? In devising an answer to this question, he goes beyond the conventional response that the existence and level of interest group activity is a perfect reflection of the discontent felt by different social groups. Differential rates of political mobilization among social groups, he argues, cannot be adequately explained by reference to the cultural or psychological characteristics of individual citizens themselves. Instead, Walker argues that the level of political mobilization in the society at any time is largely the result of public policy. More specifically, as he states, "it is determined mainly by the political and administrative policies toward political activity in force at the time, the presence and accessibility of willing patrons of political activity, and the patterns of conflict and social cleavage in the society." Effective political participation is much more likely if social groups can rely on established institutions to sustain their political activity rather than depending exclusively on individual citizens.

Walker points to three sources of institutional support available to social groups. Groups in the profit-making sector can rely on commercial and occupational organizations to represent their interests. Those social groups operating in the non-profit realm must depend on two much more fragile sources of support—the mobilization that emerges from the enthusiasm and energy of social movements and the institutional support provided by permanent agencies of the government itself. But these latter sources of institutional support—especially that instigated, financed, and encouraged by governmental agencies—are available only in highly consensual policy areas. Where conflict is high, governmental support wanes. According to Walker, this creates a major dilemma in American politics because it means that social and economic discontent will not necessarily lead to political mobilization due to a lack of institutional support. "The reason why some of the most deprived elements of American society are either ignored or represented in the legislative process only by small non-member organizations," he declares, "is not because they are essentially satisfied with their status and have no interest in political activity. It is because there is no institutional foundation from which a successful effort at mobilization can be launched."

Walker's paper is an insightful, well-argued essay that raises a crucial issue about the nature of American politics. It will undoubtedly stimulate a great deal of research and discussion by both defenders and critics of the American political system. Professor Wallerstein's paper, "The Micro-Foundations of Corporatism: Formal Theory and Comparative

Analysis," develops a formal model to account for national differences in union centralization. He argues that the obstacles and inducements to centralize are essentially political rather than economic in character, and that this leads to marked variation in the degree to which unions in capitalist democracies are centralized. Unions seeking to increase their income have recourse to two quite different types of public policies: protectionist measures and welfare provisions. The former pit sector against sector while the latter pit class against class. According to Wallerstein's model, union centralization is inconsistent with protectionism because of the political conflict it generates. As a consequence, unions will only choose to centralize where protectionist policies are ineffective and disadvantageous: namely, in those countries that are small in size and rely heavily on non-agricultural exports. In these countries protectionist policies are foreclosed because of the small domestic markets and the threat of retaliation and loss of foreign markets. In this situation, as Wallerstein concludes, "welfare policies are the only political means available to unions . . . to increase the income and security of their members." And the centralization of unions strengthens their hand in the political struggle to increase welfare provisions. Wallerstein's model leads to a paradoxical conclusion: unions achieve their greatest political strength where they are most vulnerable to the international market.

Wallerstein's paper clearly illustrates how formal, rigorous models can clarify and illuminate complex political realities. It is a fine example of analytical political economy.

Ralph J. Bunche Award (\$500), for the best scholarly work in political science published in 1983 or 1984 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Recipients: **Rufus P. Browning**, San Francisco State University; **Dale Rogers Marshall**, University of California, Davis; and **David H. Tabb**, San Francisco State University. *Protest Is Not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in Urban Politics*, University of California Press.

Selection Committee: William E. Nelson, Jr., Ohio State University, Chair; Amy Bridges, Harvard University; Herman D. Lujan, University of Washington.

Citation: After a careful examination of the books sent to us, and thorough consultation between us, the members of the Bunche Book Awards Committee for 1985 have selected the volume *Protest Is Not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in Urban Politics* by Rufus P. Browning, Dale

Rogers Marshall and David H. Tabb, to receive the Bunche Award at the 1985 annual convention of the American Political Science Association in New Orleans. The judgment of the Committee was unanimous and enthusiastic. We all agreed that the Browning et al. study was a well-researched, balanced account of a significant issue in the field of ethnic politics. While the regional scope of the data used in the book is narrow, the study nevertheless provides convincing evidence that a sharp distinction must be made by both professional analysts and activists between protest politics and the politics of policy implementation (i.e., governance). This book calls attention to the continuing need to forge multiracial coalitions, and to link the dynamics of protest politics with the process of electoral mobilization in order to achieve meaningful minority advancement in the realm of urban politics.

The assertions made above, of course, are not new. What is valuable about the Browning book is the vast array of data assembled to document and validate the accuracy of these broad assumptions. The breadth and incisiveness of the analysis makes the Browning et al. book a major contribution to the field of ethnic politics. We are pleased to recommend this path-breaking volume for the Bunche Award this year.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award (\$1,000), for the best political science publication in 1984 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Recipients: **Rufus P. Browning**, San Francisco State University; **Dale Rogers Marshall**, University of California, Davis; and **David H. Tabb**, San Francisco State University. *Protest Is Not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in Urban Politics*, University of California Press.

Selection Committee: Charles S. Bullock, III, University of Georgia, Chair; Joel D. Aberbach, University of Michigan; and Kay L. Schlozman, Boston College.

Citation: The behavior of minorities and the response evoked among the majority have been a continuing issue of the American political experiment. In this outstanding study of the political activities of America's two largest contemporary minority groups, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb not only shed light on the conditions associated with successful integration into the political mainstream, they have produced significant hypotheses useful in understanding the emergence of past and future minority groups as important political actors on the national and local scene. This work combines the meticulous attention to detail characteristic of case studies with

multivariate techniques to provide a longitudinal analysis of the conditions under which minority groups are likely to obtain their policy objectives. Ten California cities were studied over a 20-year period. *Protest Is Not Enough* sorts out the conditions under which minorities have succeeded in winning public office and in influencing the distribution of public goods in accord with their agendas. This study is further enhanced by the presence of two minorities—blacks who under some conditions have enjoyed great success—and Hispanics who have been consistently less successful than blacks in gaining an influential role in the governing coalitions of the ten cities.

Much of the recent work on minorities has focused on the acquisition of public offices. In parts of the country, particularly the South, the growth in office-holding has been attributable to federal initiatives designed to protect the political rights of minorities. Browning, Marshall, and Tabb undertake a comprehensive analysis. They consider both the effects of office-holding by blacks and Hispanics and the preconditions for achieving public office. In assessing the impact of minorities in public office the authors examine federal programs, such as model cities and community development block grants, and local items such as public employment.

The peaceful and violent protests of the 1960s attracted much scholarly attention and debate over whether these strategies sufficed to promote the policy goals of blacks. As their title states, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb conclude that while protest may be useful, it alone will not produce the redistribution of power and greater governmental responsiveness necessary to address minorities' grievances. Rather it is essential that minorities be politically mobilized and, most importantly, that they become part of the coalition that controls the city council. The conclusions of *Protest Is Not Enough* emphasize the importance of political factors, particularly electoral efforts, thereby shifting a focus that in recent years has often concentrated on bureaucratic routines to explain policy decisions.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$2,000), for the best book published in the U.S. during 1984 on government, politics or international affairs.

Recipient: **Barry R. Posen**, Princeton University. *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany between the World Wars*, Cornell University Press.

Selection Committee: Barbara Hinckley, University of Wisconsin, Chair; Douglas E. Ash-

ford, University of Pittsburgh; and Joyce K. Kallgren, University of California, Davis.

Citation: *The Sources of Military Doctrine* represents an original departure from earlier military studies, both in its breadth of theory and rigor of method. It links the study of military doctrine and strategy to larger questions of international politics, security theory, and the role of leadership in policymaking, while at the same time it illuminates a period of history, between the two world wars, with which many would consider themselves quite familiar. Its use of historical data in relation to well-formulated hypotheses is an important methodological contribution, and can serve as a model for future studies of this kind. Rigorously comparative in analysis, written with great clarity and balance, the book offers innovative political science grounded in solid historical research.

We are pleased to offer this year's Woodrow Wilson award to an author who has substantially expanded the enterprise of political research—not only in the field of defense policy, but with implications for the study of international relations, policy analysis, and the combining of systematic historical evidence with political science techniques.

Benjamin E. Lippincott Award (\$1,500), for a work of exceptional quality by a living political theorist that is still considered significant after a time span of at least 15 years since the original publication.

Recipient: **Sheldon Wolin**, Princeton University. *Politics and Vision*.

Selection Committee: Fred R. Dallmayr, University of Notre Dame, Chair; George J. Graham, Jr., Vanderbilt University; and Susan Moller Okin, Brandeis University.

Citation: According to its governing guidelines the Benjamin E. Lippincott Award was established to recognize a work of exceptional quality by a living political theorist that is "still considered significant after a time span of at least fifteen years since the original date of publication." The Award Committee this year was composed of Professors George J. Graham of Vanderbilt University, Susan Moller Okin of Brandeis University, and myself as chair. After reviewing a dozen or more authors and their publications, the Award Committee almost spontaneously reached a unanimous decision, a decision predicated on the outstanding scholarship, depth of insight, and profound pedagogical influence of the chosen recipient: Professor Sheldon Wolin of Princeton University. The work singled out for purposes of the Award is his book *Politics and Vision*, first published in 1960 and now in the process of being republished. However, while

focusing on this book, the Committee placed the study in the context of the author's broader publication record and of his widely recognized standing as a leading political theorist in our time.

Written during the heyday of positivism, *Politics and Vision* was a summons to a reorientation of political theory and of the discipline as a whole. "In many intellectual circles today," Wolin wrote in his Preface, "there exists a marked hostility towards, and even contempt for, political philosophy in its traditional form. My hope is that this volume, if it does not give pause to those who are eager to jettison what remains of the tradition of political philosophy, may at least succeed in making clear what it is we shall have discarded." This statement has lost none of its pertinence today—at a time when our discipline is precariously veering toward applied science and policy research while philosophical speculation seems enamored with a kind of intellectual "deconstruction" of the past which fails to weigh innovative "destruction" against the constantly needed "reconstruction" of traditional modes of thought. Professor Wolin's study—and in fact his entire opus—is marked by the judicious effort to balance innovation and tradition, radicalism and civility. As the title already indicates, *Politics and Vision* made a strong plea for the role of imaginative vision in political thought—but without abandoning the parameters of a shared discourse. "Imagination has involved far more than the construction of models," the opening chapter stated. "It has been the medium for expressing the fundamental values of the theorist, the means by which the political theorist has sought to transcend history. . . . An architectonic vision is one wherein the political imagination attempts to mould the totality of political phenomena to accord with some vision of the Good that lies outside the political order."

By emphasizing vision and future possibilities, the study gave hope to a generation of political theorists beleaguered by political apathy as well as widespread "hostility" towards political reflection. Placed in the broader frame of the "battle between ancients and moderns," *Politics and Vision* offered a beacon of light to students of politics disaffected with the scientism of modernity, yet unwilling or unable to abandon modern aspirations in favor of a celebration of antiquity. Viewed from this angle, Wolin emerges himself as an "epical" theorist of our age—a title he once assigned to leading representatives of the tradition of political thought. On behalf of the American Political Science Association, and expressing the gratitude of a generation of political scientists, it is a distinct honor for me to bestow on Professor Sheldon Wolin the

Benjamin Evans Lippincott Award for 1985.

Career Awards

Charles E. Merriam Award (\$500), presented to the person whose published work and career represents a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research.

Recipient: **James L. Sundquist**, The Brookings Institution.

Selection Committee: Virginia Gray, University of Minnesota, Chair; David W. Rohde, Michigan State University; and Sidney Verba, Harvard University.

Citation: James L. Sundquist exemplifies the hope of Charles Merriam that we combine the scientific study of politics with a prudent concern for public policy and the practice of democratic government. Sundquist's contributions to scientific scholarship have come from the six books and numerous articles written during his two decades at the Brookings Institution. Two books have won national prizes: *The Decline and Resurgence of Congress* and *Making Federalism Work*. His books provide us with insights into the workings of our national institutions, and they make sensible suggestions for improvement. It is fitting that his last Brookings book, *Effective Government and Constitutional Reform*, analyzes the problem of "divided government" and offers possible remedies. This book, like its predecessors, examines a significant question about the functioning of our democratic system.

Prior to coming to Brookings, Jim Sundquist had three other careers, all of which demonstrated his concern with the art of government. His first career was as a newspaper reporter in Utah; his second was as a civil servant in Washington during the postwar years; and his third career was as a political speechwriter, researcher, and ultimately political appointee in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. As Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture in the early 1960s, Sundquist helped to develop key elements of the rural phase of the War on Poverty. In these careers then, before turning full-time to scholarship, Sundquist made lasting contributions to the substance of public policy.

Finally, Sundquist has increased the impact of social science research on government through his leadership at the Brookings Institution and his own reputation within the Washington community. His scholarship is taken seriously by policymakers as well as by the discipline of political science. Few of us achieve this balance in our work.

For all these reasons we believe James Sundquist truly represents the qualities Charles Merriam valued. On behalf of the American Political Science Association and my committee members David Rohde and Sidney Verba, I am honored to present this award to such a distinguished recipient.

Carey McWilliams Award (\$500), presented each year to honor a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics.

Recipients: **Jim Lehrer** and **Robert MacNeil**, *MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour*.

Selection Committee: Michael J. Malbin, American Enterprise Institute, Chair; L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College; Jean Torcom, California State University, Sacramento.

Citation: The American Political Science Association's Carey McWilliams award is presented each year to honor "a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics." This year the award is being given jointly to Robert MacNeil and Jim Lehrer.

The award is a kind of a tenth anniversary present: the MacNeil/Lehrer Report first appeared on the air locally in New York City in October 1975. Over the past decade, MacNeil and Lehrer have transformed our ideas about what good journalism can do, enriching all of our understanding of the political world around us. Other television producers have tried to copy the format. But MacNeil and Lehrer got there first and— together with their excellent on and off camera team—they still do it the best.

Anyone who is seriously interested in current events has to be impressed both with MacNeil's and Lehrer's conception of a news show and with the way they and their colleagues succeed in bringing that conception to life. Their show seems to be based on three underlying premises: (1) that people's ideas matter, especially the ideas held by people who are in a position to make, influence or analyze government and politics; (2) that the audience deserves to hear those ideas directly, instead of filtered and predigested through an intermediary; and (3) that the audience will sit still for serious analysis, discussion or debate. Because MacNeil and Lehrer have had this faith in their audience, viewers all around the country have had a chance to experience something that used to be open only to people with press passes: a direct and unbiased access to the people and ideas in the news.

Political scientists have a special reason for appreciating the MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour. For us, watching the show is like taking a daily field trip. We use the show actively, to keep us informed so we can do our work. The

amazing thing is that we did not even know we needed the show until we started watching it. Of course, it is flattering that MacNeil and Lehrer like to invite political scientists to appear as guests. But that is only a symbol of what counts. What we really appreciate is that MacNeil and Lehrer care about questions we believe are worth asking.

For ten years now, MacNeil and Lehrer have honored us, in our capacity as political scientists, by taking politics and policy seriously. They have also honored us, along with everyone else in their audience, with their assumptions about what the audience wants to know. We are delighted, therefore, to turn around and honor them by presenting them with the 1985 Carey McWilliams Award.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award (\$500), presented each year in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

Recipient: **Robert C. Wood**, Wesleyan University.

Selection Committee: Alan Rosenthal, Rutgers University, Chair; Kathleen A. Frankovic, CBS News; and Sidney Waldman, Haverford College.

Citation: This is the third time the Association has presented the Hubert H. Humphrey Award honoring "notable public service by a political scientist." The first presentation in 1983 was to Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who distinguished himself in the U.S. Senate. The second presentation in 1984 was to John Brademas, who distinguished himself in the U.S. House.

This year we are especially delighted to present the Hubert H. Humphrey Award to Robert C. Wood. Not only does Robert Wood richly deserve this award, but his career serves as an example for all of us. It demonstrates that we do not have to serve in Congress in order to achieve distinction in public service. We do not have to be elected U.S. senator or congressman in order to receive recognition from the APSA. Wood's career shows that it is possible as political scientists to distinguish ourselves in appointive as well as elective office. All we have to do is hold top leadership positions at national, state, and local levels, meet the most demanding political and administrative challenges, and put ourselves constantly on the line.

No one has more effectively bridged the academic and political worlds than has Robert Wood, moving back and forth over a career span of 35 years. He combines in beautiful balance the strains of political scientist and political practitioner.

As political practitioner, Robert Wood is proof

that our system of federalism is alive and well. He started off at the Florida Legislative Reference Bureau. From Tallahassee he travelled to Washington, D.C. and a stint with the Bureau of the Budget. Then to academia. After fifteen years at Harvard and M.I.T., he returned to Washington as Undersecretary, and briefly as Secretary, of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. He went from HUD back to the states, where he served seven years in another intense political environment—as President of the University of Massachusetts. Finally, he took on his toughest job of all, at the local level as Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools.

As political scientist, Robert Wood is proof that research, writing, teaching, and public service can be enjoyable and complementary pursuits. His publications include books on the politics of suburbia, on metropolitan government, and on the urban crisis, and he is now writing on management and public policy. For the past two years he has been teaching at Wesleyan University, where he is proving that experience is indeed the best teacher—at least as he reflects on it, conceptualizes it, and communicates it to students.

As a discipline, we have not had an easy time defining what the “public interest” is, but as citizens we define it by our practice. Robert Wood has a keen sense of what it is and a real feeling for what it requires. In his career of public service in both the university and in government, he has committed himself to advancing the public interest. For living on the basis of that commitment, he has earned the award that we present to him today. It is with great pride that we honor Robert Wood, our colleague.

APSA Council Minutes

The Council met in the Marlborough Room of the New Orleans Hilton Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana, on August 28, 1985 at 9:30 a.m. *Present:* Charles W. Anderson, Robert Axelrod, Brian Barry, Joseph Cooper, Richard F. Fenno, Jr. (presiding), F. Chris Garcia, Robert G. Gilpin, Jr., Matthew P. Holden, Jr., Samuel P. Huntington, Helen Ingram, Nannerl Keohane, Thomas E. Mann, J. Donald Moon, Victor A. Olorunsola, Norman J. Ornstein, Benjamin I. Page, Samuel C. Patterson, Michael B. Preston, Bruce M. Russett, Arlene Saxonhouse, Steven Seitz, Donna E. Shalala, W. Phillips Shively, Susan Welch, Aaron Wildavsky, Gerald Wright, Dina A. Zinnes. *Staff:* R. Hauck, S. Mann, C. Rudder, J. Walen, M. Woodard.

President Fenno opened the meeting by

reporting on the August 27 meeting of the Administrative Committee. He pointed out that two items were disposed of by the Administrative Committee: (1) The proposal that the Executive Director be given a discretionary fund was rejected on the grounds that in the judgment of the Executive Director, present budgetary arrangements afforded sufficient flexibility. (2) A proposal from the Research Support Committee to publish a fifth issue of the *APSR* containing selected papers from the annual meeting and additional essays commissioned by the President was tabled on the grounds that the need was being filled by other Association publications (*PS*, *NEWS*) and that it might interfere with plans of the new *APSR* editors. The Council took no exception to the actions of the Administrative Committee.

Council Minutes

The Council reviewed the minutes of the April 12, 1985 meeting of the Council.

Council Action: The Council minutes were approved.

President-Elect Wildavsky's Committee Appointments

The Council reviewed the appointments to 31 committees submitted by President-Elect Aaron Wildavsky.

Council Action: The Council approved the appointments with the stipulation that Wildavsky is authorized to make substitutions if necessary.

Appointments to Committee on International Political Science

The Council noted the appointments made by President Fenno and President-Elect Wildavsky to serve on the new Committee on International Political Science: Harold Jacobson, University of Michigan, chair; Jerry Hough, Duke University; David Mayhew, Yale University; Robert Putnam, Harvard University; and Susan L. Shirk, University of California, San Diego.

Report of the Treasurer

Treasurer Susan Welch reported that the overall financial condition of the Association remains healthy. A surplus of almost \$60,000 was recorded in the 1985-86 fiscal year. (Welch's detailed report will be printed in the Fall 1985 *PS*.) T. Mann reviewed the Report on Financial Statements, Year Ended June 30, 1984, prepared by Garner, Bloom & Klein, Chartered, the Association's auditing